

REMARKS

The request for continued examination (RCE) is submitted in response to the the final Office Action of June 1, 2005 and following a subsequent telephone interview with the Examiner on July 8, 2005.

The purpose of the telephone interview was to convince the Examiner to allow the case as is and, if the Examiner is not convinced, to discuss possible limitations of independent claims 1 and 16 which will clearly separate them from the prior art quoted by the Examiner in the office action mailed on June 1, 2005 and place claims 1 and 16 into the condition for allowance.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner was not convinced with the presented arguments for allowing the case as is. For example, the Examiner dismissed the arguments for lacking motivation of combining references, e.g., in order to reject claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 16, 18, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namekata et al. (U.S. 5,648,991) in view of Maalej et al. (U.S. 6,160,443), as required by the MPEP paragraph 2143 and the case law.

On the other hand, the Examiner indicated during the telephone interview that if "with each other" added to the end of feature (e) of claim 1 and prior to "to obtain" in feature (e) of claim 16, it will remove rejection of claims 1-7 and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) presented in the final Office action of June 1, 2005. However, the Examiner also pointed out that even if the appropriate amendment is

submitted, it will require a new search for allowing the case.

The Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner and confirm the arguments presented in the AMEDMENT A filed on May 4, 2005. Indeed "comparing output signals of said channel equalizing operation and said reference channel equalizing operation" (as recited in claim 1 of the present invention) implies that the output signals are compared to each other which is fully supported by the specification. To make this point clearer and satisfy the Examiner's request, the Applicant amends claims 1 and 16 by adding "to each other" statement thus obviating the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in the final Office action of June 1, 2005.

Consideration and allowance of all claims are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anatoly Frenkel
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 54,106

AZF/mef
August 8, 2005
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234